To: Dawn Chapman Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy; Nagel, Chris[Christopher.Nagel@dnr.mo.gov]; Schmidt, Aaron[aaron.schmidt@dnr.mo.gov]; Daren.Eppley@ago.mo.gov[Daren.Eppley@ago.mo.gov]; DeGregorio, Kerry (Blunt)[Kerry_DeGregorio@blunt.senate.gov]; Joeana middleton@mccaskill.senate.gov]

Cc: Bill Otto[Bill.Otto@house.mo.gov]; Harvey Ferdman[HarveyFerdman@aol.com]; Doug

Clemens Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy | Karen Nickel Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy | Bethanne

S Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy | Debi Disser Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy |; Ferguson,

Jaci[Ferguson.Jaci@epa.gov]
From: Washburn, Ben

Sent: Fri 8/22/2014 7:33:34 PM

Subject: RE: Health Physicist hired by the community

Hi Dawn,

Thanks for this email. As you know we are always interested in hearing the concerns and perspective of the community as we continue towards a final remedy at the site.

Regarding the MDNR comments, we work very closely with our state partners to ensure that PRP documents are given the scrutiny necessary to ensure that any proposed work will adequately protect human health and the environment.

Regarding the community paying for private review of documents related to the site, as you know EPA has the TASC contract in place to provide support to the community and to conduct these kinds of document reviews. The ability to apply for a Technical Assistance Grant is available to the CAG as well.

Again, thank you for your email. We'll continue to work with the CAG and the community throughout the Superfund process at the site.

Benjamin M. Washburn

Public Affairs Specialist

EPA Region 7

(913) 551-7364

From: Dawn Chapman [mailto Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 8:24 PM

To: Washburn, Ben; Nagel, Chris; Schmidt, Aaron; Daren. Eppley@ago.mo.gov; DeGregorio,

Kerry (Blunt); Joeana_middleton@mccaskill.senate.gov

Cc: Bill Otto; Harvey Ferdman; Doug Clemens; Karen Nickel; Bethanne S; Debi Disser

Subject: Health Physicist hired by the community

Hello All.

I'm enclosing an evaluation done by J. Stewart Bland, CHP paid for by and on behalf of this community. I want to start by stating that the reason we engaged Mr. Bland is because of the EPA response to Paul Rosasco dated July 1, 2014 copied below:

"The EPA is aware that the Missouri Department of Natural Resources provided a number of comments on the draft Work Plan in a letter dated June 18, 2014. The Respondents requested direction from the EPA on how to respond to these comments in an e-mail from Paul Rosasco to Dan Gravatt dated June 20, 2014. MDNR is not a signatory to the Order and its comments should be considered advisory and not obligatory. Given the timing of these comments, and as I believe that some of MDNR's comments have been addressed, there is no requirement that Respondents' address these comments."

<u>http://www</u>.epa.gov/region07/cleanup/west_lake_landfill/pdf/west-lake-epa-approval-final-ib-workplan.pdf

While we understand that MODNR is not part of the CERCLA process as far as approval goes, this community feels that the questions they raised and have raised in the past are valid and reflect the concerns of the citizens who live in and around this landfill as well as the opinions of DHSS. It's never been more important than now for all agencies to show their ability to work together and I think everyone will agree that taking a few extra minutes and addressing the concerns of the state agency responsible for the fire should be strongly encouraged!

Lastly,I would like to point out that each time a new set of eyes ..this time a very experienced health physicist..looks at these plans and documents written by EMSI and the responsible parties, they find problems and concerns. It is my understanding that EPA does have the ability under CERCLA to ask that another contractor be used instead of EMSI. There is something very wrong when this community is paying its own health physicist to look over these plans. I think its also worth noting, in case someone states that this man is biased, that Mr. Bland is the one who found the error in the lab report released by Pattonville High School. The level listed was 4.63 pCi/g and he pointed out that they had made a mistake and it was actually much lower!

Thank you and I would appreciate some sort of response so we can discuss what this means and who is going to address these concerns.

Dawn Chapman

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy